

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
SPECIAL - MEETING MINUTES**

May 26, 2015

4:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. John Stetler, Chairperson called meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present:	Rick Barnes	James Moreno
	Deland Davis	Carlyle Sims
	Greg Dunn	Becky Squires
	Samuel Gray	John Stetler

Members Excused: (All Present)

Staff Present: Marcel Stoetzel, Assist. City Attorney
Christine Zuzga, Planning & Zoning Supervisor
Leona Parrish, Admin. Assistant, Planning Dept.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA: None

CORRESPONDANCE: An email from Mr. Andy Wenzel stating his opposition to appeal # Z-02-15 regarding 1745 E. Columbia Avenue was handed out to each board member.

OLD BUSINESS: None

OPENING COMMENTS: *Mr. John Stetler, Chairperson stated the meeting procedure where everyone present may speak either for or against an appeal and that he will ask for a staff report to be read and then open the public hearing. At the public hearing persons may come forward and state their name and address for the record as it is being recorded and then speak either for or against an appeal and to please limit their time to 5 minutes. The public hearing will then be closed and the zoning board will discuss and make a decision. Mr. Stetler stated if denied the petitioner may appeal to the Circuit Court.*

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Appeal #Z-01-15 (106 Lathrop Avenue):

Mr. James L. Juhnke, Attorney, 835 Golden Avenue, Battle Creek, MI, on behalf of owner Ms. Precious B. Holder, requesting a use variance to allow a three-unit residential use in a legal non-conforming two-unit residential for a property zoned "R-1C Single Family Residential District" located at 106 Lathrop Avenue. The variance application is requested pursuant to Planning and Zoning Code, Chapter 1288.04 and 1248.02.

Ms. Christine Zuzga, Planning and Zoning Supervisor, stated this property is zoned "R-1C Single Family Residential District" which allows single-family units by right; staff has done the legal non-conforming investigation to determine that two were legally non-conforming for this property and there was a third one in the unit that the City has been dealing with for the past few years. The City recently went to court where they upheld our decision and determination and said the property owner

could apply for a use variance to allow the third-unit. Stated as outlined in the staff report, State Law and also our local ordinance requires there to be unnecessary hardship in order for a use variance to be approved, and an unnecessary hardship is one where the property cannot comply with the zoning regulations of that district. Said staff does not feel this request meets those standards as it was built as a single-family home with a second unit legally added and do not feel that it cannot be used in compliance with the zoning district that allows one-unit or the second non-conforming unit. Said there is nothing unique about the property to satisfy the standards of being unique in nature and approval would set a precedence, and the additional unit would be inconsistent with the current zoning ordinance and the Master Plan Future Land Use Map for that area and feel this property can be used in accordance with the zoning district and recommend denial.

Mr. James L. Juhnke, Attorney for the property owner Ms. Precious B. Holder was present to speak and stated that in 1927 this property was zoned single-family residential and had been an ideal district at that time; noted they have had multiple variances approved in the past years in that area. Said the city records showed this was a three-unit in 1993-1994 and was insured as such; noted in 2007 the city decided the code and zoning were to be split and in the past 25 years it had been used as an apartment. Said in 2010 the first enforcement letter had been sent to the owner saying they had a choice of only to use two-units and had filled out code enforcement; was delayed until June by the City because she did not choose between the two-units and had passed all code issues. Said he found the language in Ch. #1234.04(d)(2) and have issues with this ordinance. Stated the Judges findings are not complete and gave an option to correct the situation of which there are two motions pending before that court and that the hearing is in approximately 1 ½ weeks to make a determination if the ticket issued is legal. Mr. Juhnke stated the City had assumed the issue had been addressed and did not do their job.

Mr. Juhnke presented an aerial map of the Post Addition area stating it outlined in yellow those properties having a variance and having the same lot size. Stated the 3rd unit is a reasonable use as it had been used as such for 27-years and was a grandfathered use and is here to do what is fair and does not affect the neighborhood. Said this was not self-created and the property was purchased with three-units and not his client's fault the City had not enforced in 27 years. Stated the neighborhood is not a single-family residence neighborhood and should be rezoned; that Judge Line asked the Zoning Board to make a decision, he is asking for fairness, equity, logic applied to the zoning of this one small house on a 50 ft. lot to continue its use to which it had been put for the last 27 years.

Mr. Greg Dunn asked when purchased in 1994 had they checked with the city for the zoning of this property regarding how many units this property had. Mr. Juhnke stated there was a law suit with the prior owners of whether or not it was a three-unit apartment building and his clients prevailed in that litigation and the sales agreement at that time stated it was a three-unit; said honestly he did not know if they did checked the zoning and that he knows it is important to do so.

Mr. Dunn asked if when the city had not enforced at that time; how is it any different than if he lives on a street and the city sets the speed limit and he has been speeding for 15-years without a ticket and then one time an officer writes him a ticket; how is that different. Mr. Juhnke stated there is pending legislation that says that speed limit sign is not the law; it is the average speed that individual is using that road with and is an equitable approach to the law and/or selective enforcement of the law.

Mr. Dunn stated he read that in 2011 the applicant applied for the rental registration and at that time they identified this apartment as a three-unit apartment. Mr. Juhnke stated yes. Mr. Dunn asked if the

city took that application in 2007 and never contacted his client again until 2010. Mr. Juhnke stated yes, they granted her a three-unit permission for Code Compliance, and this is where it gets complicated as now you have Code Compliance and also Zoning Enforcement; which is the problem they are having.

Mr. Carlyle Sims asked if this was a basement apartment and if it had off street parking. Mr. Juhnke stated yes to both questions and owner stated she has a three car garage and driveway.

Ms. Arletha Holder, 104 Lathrop, stated she is for this variance and lives next door to this property and it is a nice property and is not run down. Said tenants have been happy there and it also helps the neighborhood.

Mr. John Stetler asked if there was any further discussion, seeing none he would entertain a motion.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MS. BECKY SQUIRES IN FAVOR OF THE APPELLANT TO APPROVE APPEAL #Z-01-15 TO ALLOW A THREE-UNIT RESIDENTIAL USE IN A LEGAL NON-CONFORMING TWO-UNIT RESIDENTIAL FOR PROPERTY ZONED “R-1C SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL” FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 106 LATHROP AVENUE; SECONDED BY MR. DELAND DAVIS.

Discussion:

Mr. Greg Dunn asked staff if it was listed as a three bedroom when the application was accepted in the past and why does it not constitute in 2007 as being a grandfathered unit. Ms. Zuzga, Planning Manager, stated for it to be grandfathered in the unit would have had to have been constructed when it was permitted by ordinance and allowed by zoning. Stated there is case law that says an incorrect decision of a city official does not warrant approval of an actual request. Said in 2007 when the new ordinance had been complete they were not reviewing applications from a use stand-point and just making sure the parking requirements were met. When applicant applied in 2010 for a renewal, the City had started doing legal nonconforming investigations into the history of properties based on zoning ordinances and maps and its previous use to quantify what was legal nonconforming and at that point they told the property owner it was only two-units and gave options to correct the situation and that is when owner submitted a new rental registration permit for two-units. Ms. Zuzga noted that background information had not been included in this meeting packet as it was not relevant to this use request as the appeal of staff determination was essentially performed by the court.

Mr. Greg Dunn requested information about applicable case law.

Mr. Marcel Stoetzel, Assistant Attorney, said it is correct what Ms. Zuzga stated regarding the case law of zoning enforcement as the city is still entitled to enforce its zoning code no matter what passage of time. Said it was the same as per case law for speeding, it still is enforceable when caught and regarding this issue zoning is different than rental approval; it takes both to have a valid rental unit that is properly within the zoning district.

Mr. Greg Dunn asked referred to the map provided by Mr. Juhnke with the properties highlighted in yellow; said being on the Zoning Board for many years he does not recall remembering all of these properties going through the approval process and questioned if they are legally grandfathered

properties, and if so how did they become legally grandfathered properties and not this particular property.

Christine Zuzga stated she had not received a listing of those properties shown on the map in order to review them and is not sure if it is consistent with the list that was included with the meeting packet. Said we have no record these properties have gone through for a use variance and if the units were created before the zoning changed they would be legal nonconforming. For example, the City did not have zoning before 1924 and if a three-unit was constructed in 1920 and maintained over time they would be allowed to continue as a legal nonconforming use. Each property will be different based on its history.

Mr. Greg Dunn asked they have had three-units since 1994; do we accept that and do we know when it went to three-units. Ms. Zuzga stated based on assessing records it does appear that is what happened and stated our records show in 1950 there was a building permit for a rec-room in the basement and the permit specifically stated no rental dwelling units in the basement and that it could only be used as a rec room as it did not meet code and noted the egress was not appropriate enough; those documents predate the year 1974.

Mr. Carlyle Sims asked how it had gotten changed in 2007 when it was in compliance and not now.

Ms. Zuzga said prior to 2007 it was in compliance for code compliance housing standards and also from zoning standards for parking only, which at that time was the only review that zoning had done.

Mr. Juhnke said they still need to go before Judge Line; said when his client applied for three units, the city clerk changed the application from 3 units to 2 units and that his client had not made this change. Said the District Court is a court with limited jurisdiction and it is the Circuit Court that has that ability and many of the issues being discussed here are exactly the issues that would come in the next step if it was necessary to go to that extent. Said they want to do what is right here as it is one case and sets no precedent for anything and his client is entitled to have that third unit after 27 years.

Mr. Marcel Stoetzel raised a point of order stating there were eight zoning board members present and only seven were to vote. Ms. Christine Zuzga identified the alternate member was Mr. Carlyle Sims was not entitled to vote. Mr. John Stetler confirmed that Mr. Carlyle Sims was the alternate member. Mr. John Stetler informed Mr. Carlyle Sims that because he was the alternate member, and with eight members present he would not be allowed to vote on the request.

MR. JOHN STETLER ASKED FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, SEEING NONE A VOTE WAS TAKEN; FOUR IN FAVOR (BARNES, DUNN, GRAY, AND SQUIRES); THREE OPPOSED (DAVIS, MORENO AND STETLER), MOTION DENIED

Although Mr. John Stetler initially stated the appeal had passed Planning Director Christine Zuzga made a point of order that a use variance is required to have an affirmative vote of five in order to be approved. (City of Battle Creek Ordinances 1234.04(g)) Chairperson, Mr. John Stetler acknowledged the error.

B. Appeal #Z-02-15 (1745 E. Columbia Avenue):

Petition received from Mr. James Maceroni, 8960 E. Shore Drive, Portage, MI 49002, on behalf of owners ACW Inc. requesting a dimensional variance to allow an adult business to operate closer than 300 ft. from a residential district and closer than 1,000 feet from a public park.

Mr. Greg Dunn stated he has a conflict of interest due to his job and will be abstaining from participating in this appeal. Mr. Stetler asked if the alternate would now be eligible to vote on this appeal. Mr. Marcel Stoetzel stated yes, that would be appropriate.

Ms. Christine Zuzga provided the staff report noting this is a dimensional variance from Chapter 1295.03(b) that regulates where and how an adult business can operate and the ordinance requires that it must be located 300 ft. from a residential district and 1,000 feet from a public park, church and or school. Stated this property is a split zone for commercial and residential and that any variance request has to prove practical difficulty in complying with the ordinance or if there is something unique or extraordinary with the situation of the property that makes it impossible to comply with the zoning ordinance. Said in doing the review based on the statute and legislation, staff does not feel it meets the criteria for a variance as a practical difficulty does not exist as they can continue to use the property in accordance with the zoning district it is located which allows almost 40 different uses at that property. Said staff does not find anything particular about this property that warrants the issuance of a variance, and there are other properties within the city that may be available for this type of use and permitted by right. It is staffs opinion that if the variance is granted the intent of the ordinance would be altered and the rights of others potentially compromised. When they adopted the ordinance in the early 90's it was done so recognizing the potential detrimental effects of properties in the neighborhoods with these types of uses and that is what they based these regulations on when the ordinance was adopted. Staff also believes the variance exceeds the minimum necessary to provide any relief, and recommends denial of the request.

Attorney Nelson Karre, of Vandervort Christ & Fisher, P.C. came forward to speak on behalf of applicant Mr. Jim Maceroni who is also present; stated he would like Mr. Charles Cherney to speak first as he is not able to stay for the entire meeting.

Mr. Charles Cherney, Commercial Appraiser in Battle Creek, asked to address this property's use; being vacant in the past and having failed several times, the issue is it has not been successful in the past and has been vacant and could see in a few years it may be condemned. Mr. Cherney said it has not been his experience in the past that liquor, adult clubs, etc. have harmed the values of the neighboring properties. Stated he does not see it harming the neighborhood as it would be all inside and would not diminish the neighborhood property values as it would be putting the property to use, therefore bringing the values back up.

Mr. Nelson Karre stated this is not a use variance request it is an adult cabaret per the ordinance and is allowed in a C-3 zoning and what they have is a practical difficulty as this type of use cannot be carried out in strict compliance with the zoning ordinance for the reasons Ms. Zuzga pointed out. Stated it is zero-feet from the residential zone and less than 1,000 ft. from a park which is not visible from the building. Said this is an opportunity for a better use for this building and property as it has been vacant for some time and has only been used as a bar/nightclub for 38 plus years. Said Mr. Maceroni plan to continue its use with live entertainment and that they plan to extensively renovate the building which would be an improvement to what is there now. Stated there is practical difficulty by boundaries based on the Master Plan as it states in C-3 zone an adult business may be established. Mr.

Karre noted that Mr. Maceroni's other businesses there have not been security issues and is an older clientele and cannot prove the property values will decline and that the Heartbeats establishment residents have not had any issues. Said it is not a matter of inconvenience or setbacks and it must be exceptional as it has been exceptional and that the 300 ft. setback from residential is the issue. Mr. Karre stated that we need to balance the claims that somehow this use which is what has been going on for forty years will reduce property values, which has not been proven and have no impact. In this case we are talking about setbacks not use, because its use is permitted and is not a matter of inconvenience as it has to have a variance for this type of business. This is an existing business that will continue its use with a larger food menu along with live entertainment; provided a menu and photos from applicants other businesses. Mr. Karre stated he is asking the board to approve this variance.

Mr. James Maceroni, stated he is the owner of Angels in Kalamazoo for seven-years and has owned bars and restaurants for 32-years; provided photos of Angels before and after of that business. Said he opened the location in Kalamazoo as it was difficult to make it work in the bar/restaurant business without some type of entertainment and has had no trouble at that business and it has been successful. Said they have had no fights or trouble, as with his experience in the past with nightclubs there was trouble. Stated he will make the building beautiful with his business entirely inside and will provide lunch and dinner menu and noted that the State of Michigan has approved. Mr. Maceroni said there is a lot of damage to this building needing repair and is willing to spend the money for the renovation. Stated he thinks this would be the best use at this point and is asking the board for their approval.

Mr. Nelson Karre stated they provided Mr. George Bratcher's report, menu, interior photos and photos of Mr. Maceroni's Kalamazoo business; they are requesting approval and ask to be able to respond to any opposition.

Ms. Judy Heppler, 1790 E. Columbia Ave., stated she owns 80 acres across the street (20 acres in City of Battle Creek and 60 acres in Emmett Twp.) which are two family entertainment centers and does not feel it is appropriate; because of loud noise from the bar and trouble of which they have had in the past. Said she would rather see an empty building than a topless bar and feel it would impact her property value.

Mr. Steve Buller, 16555 10 Mile Rd., stated he is on the Board of Trustees for Emmett Township and also an Emmett Township property owner and is in favor of this property to be renovated for a restaurant business and not for an adult entertainment activity. Said Emmett Township has a lot of vacant buildings as well as the City of Battle Creek where these uses are accepted and approved. Said this type of businesses does not need to be on the main road and are typically off the beaten path in Battle Creek and Emmett Township, which would be a better place for it in a properly zoned area. Stated he has documents (provided) from the State of Michigan web site regarding the applicant's violation history. Stated this would not be a good fit for what Emmett Township is trying to establish as the casino corridor; as they are trying to work with business owners to improve their properties and indicated that 80% of that neighborhood area is Emmett Township and he is not in favor of this variance.

Ms. Sheila McDonald, 408 Cliff Street, provided a petition of persons in the neighborhood in opposition. Stated she has lived there for 23-years and spoke with the families and they have many concerns, also property value concerns. Many persons who signed the petition are family units with

children who play in the area that go to that park and also increase traffic; asked the board if they would like this business in their back yard. Stated they have had issues in the past with the bars and that another business can strive at that location. Said that she was here today speaking for over 50 persons who signed the petition and is asking, please for it to not be allowed.

Mr. Chuck Cherny, 41 Lynwood, stated he has friends on both sides of this parcel and he has nothing wrong with a gentleman's club as long as it is in the correct location and does not feel a neighborhood and park is the right location. Said we can go and find professionals that will say what we want to hear and agree with them. Said it would be difficult to sell a residence with a business like this adjacent to it and try to convenience someone it would be a good place to raise their children. Stated most people buy homes for an investment and becomes a part of their retirement quite often and that he owns rental property near there and asked if this is a neighborhood you would want to have your families raised.

Ms. Shirley Cummings stated she understands how persons fear this type of business in their community and feel it is because of the unknown and say it would hurt their property values and would assume it would only have a sign noting the type of business. Said it had been a bar at this location when persons purchased their property knowing this type of business was there when they purchased and it would still be a bar; asked what they were afraid of. Stated if they have the right curb appeal it should not hurt at all and when it was a rock and roll bar there were cars all along the street. Said she would not want her children camping in their back yard if it were a rock and roll bar let alone an adult entertainment. Said a lot of persons would say it is not good for the community and that a casino is not good either but it is here and we need to look at it and say what their real fears are.

Mr. Gary Cummings, 841 Woodland Beach, stated he is the owner and is trying to sell this property. Said he bought it in 1978 and ran it as successful night club for 20 plus years and have sold it on a land contract three times and failed and this gentleman is going to make improvements to this property and be an improvement for the city and also be an asset to the community. Said they are going to sell it to somebody and it is a bar; he would rather see someone willing to spend monies for improvements than those in the past and failed.

Ms. Courtney Mitchell, 160 Vale St., stated she lives nearby and had always heard loud music and police called; noted that someone was hurt and resulted in a death across the street because of drinking there in the past and does not want to bring negativity to the neighborhood. Said to allow a restaurant to be at this location and not a place for and adult business to be located.

Ms. Yvonne Powell, 341 Main St., stated she received notification as it is required by law as she lives in the vicinity and she does have concerns as they are trying to get the neighborhood to be a more of a family friendly neighborhood and is all for businesses; but feel this is not appropriate location and feel there are other locations more appropriate and realize this property has been there, but one of the challenges for the residents is to say "is this something they feel is appropriate and enhance the neighborhood". Said a person does have a right to have a business, but if they have to make adjustments and make these variances; they were put in place for a reason and if they have to make those adjustments it might not be the right place.

Mr. Nelson Karre, stated in their application they suggested a willingness to consider a condition that the board has the authority to impose, which is placing a reasonable wall/structure natural or otherwise that they think substantially may mitigate against some of the concerns the neighbors have lived with

for decades with the bar that is there and that Mr. Maceroni he believes can do something that would help with that. Said the nature of this business would not be as loud as what had been there such as a rock and roll bar as it will have DJ music and noted from the outside a person would not know what is going on inside and it would be better than what had been there in the past; this is not a rezoning but is a permitted use. Stated they can put a wall up if the board wishes. Said it is objective regarding the impact of property values going down and would improve the building structure and neighborhood.

Mr. Maceroni noted that the violation listing Mr. Buller submitted was not his; they were his son's as his name was on the license and is no longer. Said they have the same name and he does not have middle initial. Said if you read them it states the violations were all dismissed except one and it was dismissed and never went to court and happened when his son was young.

Mr. John Stetler asked if there was any further discussion, seeing none he would entertain a motion.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MS. BECKY SQUIRES IN FAVOR THE APPELLANT TO APPROVE APPEAL #Z-02-15 TO ALLOW AN ADULT BUSINESS TO OPERATE CLOSER THAN 300 FT. FROM A RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND CLOSER THAN 1,000 FEET FROM A PUBLIC PARK FOR PROPERTY ZONED "C-3 INTENSIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT" AND "R-1C SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL" FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1745 E. COLUMBIA AVENUE; SECONDED BY MR. JAMES MORENO.

Discussion:

Mr. Rick Barnes stated he lives somewhat close to "Heartbeats" establishment on 20th Street and since it became an adult entertainment venue the crime has gone down tremendously and the property has been improved greatly as well as the one on Raymond Road, as well as putting a lot of money into the property which improves the neighborhood. Said he had retired from the Battle Creek Fire Department and had inspected this property at 1745 E. Columbia several times and found that it was not in good shape; ideally if you think someone will be putting a bar there right now, they probably will not. Said the applicant is willing to invest in this property and install a fence; he understands it is scary to neighbors, but he would rather live next to that than a bar because of more fights and crime. He does have a concern for residents living nearby; but if it is done correctly and put the money into it for repairs it would be better for the city at this particular location.

Mr. Deland Davis said in the past when the zoning was created and the work they put into it including requirements for variances they felt adult entertainment was O.K. for the City of Battle Creek with provisions needing to be 300 ft. from residential areas and 1,000 ft. from parks; their reasons do not include for example that it would make the area better and often it does; he has great respect for those who setup zoning and the possibility of variances which is why we are here and how he votes today will be determined in part by his feelings along those lines.

MR. JOHN STETLER ASKED FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, SEEING NONE A VOTE WAS TAKEN; ONE IN FAVOR (BARNES); FIVE OPPOSED (DAVIS, GRAY, MORENO, SQUIRES, AND STETLER); TWO ABSTAINED (DUNN AND SIMS), MOTION DENIED

Chairperson, Mr. John Stetler noted the appeal has been denied and that they may appeal to the Circuit Court.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: WAS MADE BY MR. GREG DUNN TO APPROVE THE APRIL 14, 2015 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES AS PRESENTED; SUPPORTED BY MR. JAMES MORENO.

ALL IN FAVOR; NONE OPPOSED, MOTION CARRIED –MINUTES APPROVED.

COMMENTS BY THE PUBLIC:

A person from the audience noted thank you to the board.

COMMENTS BY THE MEMBERS / STAFF:

Mr. James Moreno stated it was important to recognize that when the residents come out and speak against an item that they do listen; so he encourages and reminds them that in the future when there are items on the agenda that they are opposed to, to come and share their opinion as they need their input to make a final decision.

Mr. Greg Dunn stated he needed to abstain from vote as the work he has done for his entire adult life deals with alcohol. Said the majority of people that own licensed establishments try and run a decent business without fights and trouble as it is bad for business and they do try to control and is regulated by the city and state and do try to run them professionally.

Mr. Deland Davis asked how a person would know if they are made an alternate. Ms. Zuzga stated Commissioner Walters when he was the Mayor made changes to the makeup of the zoning board and it was her understanding he was going to have contacted the board member and notify them. Said in the future staff will ensure the parties are informed.

Mr. Davis asked if a board member can vote on the minutes if they were not in attendance for that meeting being approved. Ms. Zuzga stated, yes.

Mr. Marcel Stoetzel stated one of the things that are important with an alternate situation is if an alternate sits in for a regular member and hears an appeal or variance request; that alternate is responsible for following up any appeal on that variance request. Said if there are further matters or it comes before the board, that same alternate is responsible for saying and hearing the rest of that matter.

Mr. Greg Dunn asked if there were a conflict of interest, should there be prior notice. Mr. Stoetzel said prior notice would always be helpful to help avoid a situation at the last minute.

Mr. Stoetzel stated to Mr. Sims that he agrees that he should know when he is attending a meeting as an alternate or regular member and if a regular member knows when they are going to be absent it helps for staff know so arrangements need can be made for an alternate to attend the meeting in place of the regular member.

Mr. Deland Davis stated there used to be a list of members noting the alternates. Ms. Zuzga stated there is a list of members on the city web site.

Mr. Rick Barnes asked how often the membership list is changed. Ms. Zuzga stated they are three-year terms and it is the Mayors discretion to; renew, remove, add new or change as an alternate.

Mr. Marcel Stoetzel stated for members to review Chapter 1234 to review roles and duties as a zoning board member or alternate.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting was adjourned at 5:36 P.M.

Submitted by: Leona A. Parrish, Administrative Assistant, Planning Department